



## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/843,429	04/25/2001	Anita B. Marsh	06269-030001	8544
26211	7590 02/08/2005		EXAM	INER
	CHARDSON P.C. P CENTER 52ND FLOO	VU, TUAN A		
153 EAST 53RD STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
NEW YORK	X, NY 10022-4611		2124	
			DATE MAILED: 02/08/200	5 .

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/843,429	MARSH ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Tuan A Vu	2124				
The MAILING DATE of this communicate Period for Reply	ion appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATOR - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicator - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) dated a lift not period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutor - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, I any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	TION.  CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a lation.  ys, a reply within the statutory minimum of thir  y period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON  by statute, cause the application to become Al	reply be timely filed  ty (30) days will be considered timely.  ITHS from the mailing date of this communication.  BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed o	n 25 <i>April 2001</i> .	·				
•	s FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) <u>1-33</u> is/are pending in the applied 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) <u>1-33</u> is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction.	vithdrawn from consideration.					
	•					
·	9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  10) The drawing(s) filed on 25 April 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the		• •				
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by	·					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for to a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority doc 2. Certified copies of the priority doc 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International  * See the attached detailed Office action for	tuments have been received.  tuments have been received in A ne priority documents have been Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	application No received in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)				
<ol> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-93)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>20010425</u>.</li> </ol>	, · ·	s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152) 				

Art Unit: 2124

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to the application filed April 25, 2001.

Claims 1-33 have been submitted for examination.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- Claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aravamudan et al., USPN: 6,584,186 (hereinafter Aravamudan), in view of Reifer et al., USPN: 6,421,727 (hereinafter Reifer).

As per claim 1, Aravamudan discloses a method comprising:

retrieving a call service component to a call controller (e.g. servlet 180, applet 175, call coordinator 160 – Fig. 1; col. 10, lines 34 to col. 11, line 17; Fig. 4); and

using the call service component to support telecommunication traffic to or from a gateway under control of the call controller (e.g. col. 12, line 40 to col. 13, line 20; Fig. 4).

But Aravamudan does not explicitly teach downloading of the call service component; however, discloses that the applet can be obtained from a network (col. 7, lines 5-18). Hence, the concept of downloading is strongly implied. Downloaling of Java components to help execute method for servicing end user calls is further taught in Reifer's system using gateway in conjunction of service providers to download code into a controller communicating with gateway (Fig. 9; col. 29 to col. 10, line 27). In case Aravamudan does not already teach downloading, it

Art Unit: 2124

would have been obvious for one skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Aravamudan's controller executing the service component so that it have capability to download applet from a external provider or code repository as shown by Reifer because this concept of retrieving ready made code, like a applet or servlet, via download from remote source was a known concept at the time the invention was made, a concept strongly implied by Aravamudan's above teachings and because it takes advantage of Browser utilities to effect the download as evidenced by Reifer, thus optimizing resource usages (col. 8, lines 16-40).

As per claim 2, Aravamudan does not explicitly teach dynamic downloading; but Reifer teaches downloading during a browser session as shown in claim 1; hence teaches dynamically downloading the call service component when a network carrier turns on a service, corresponding to the call service component, for a particular user area (Note: Reifer's session establishing a call request via Fig. 8-11 reads on service corresponding to call component for a particular user area). Hence, it would have been obvious for one skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide such dynamic loading of call service components as taught by Reifer to Aravamudan because of the browser intensive nature of the PTSN integration service by Reifer using Java based components also as taught Aravamudan (session col. 8, lines 59-65), which entails a connection activated on the basis of one user's request and a session thereof cannot be interrupted for the mere fact of downloading service programs, and this is provided via Reifer's teaching.

As per claim 3, Aravamudan discloses dynamically removing the call service component from the call controller (e.g. call takedown, disconnect command – col 11, lines 45-65).

Art Unit: 2124

As per claim 4, Aravamudan does not explicitly disclose that the call service component uses a half-call model that views a call either as an originating or a terminating segment of the call; but in view of the 2 sides of a call (e.g. Fig. 1; col. 6, lines 10-62 – Note: the use of gateways to address each end of a network communication implicitly discloses 2 segments of a call, i.e. the source side and a destination side), this half-call model is disclosed.

As per claim 5, Aravamudan (see col. 9, lines 8-17) in combination with Reifer (see Fig. 6-7) discloses or has rendered obvious, according to the rationale as set forth in claim 2 above, downloading the call service component from a central repository.

As per claim 6, Aravamudan does not specifically disclose that each segment of the call handles service and access protocols according to a previously downloaded call service component with which the segment is associated. But in view of the teaching of the double side (re claim 4) of a call establishing as shown via Fig. 1-5, the use of the applet being selected in Fig. 4 for handling the segment of the 2-sided call event is implicitly disclosed (e.g. col. 9, line 66 to col. line 17).

As per claim 7, Aravamudan does not disclose a wrapper surrounding a set of core functions, wherein the wrapper supports dynamic downloading of the component to the call controller. Official notice is taken that Java code transmitted for use across platform and using a wrapper utilities to help unravel the package, e.g. Java packages, at the recipient end for facilitating data encapsulation/transmission or security/control purposes was a known concept in network transmission at the time the invention was made. Besides, both Aravamudan and Reifer disclose security controllers and gateways, with Reifer further exhibiting security features such as data auditing or rejecting and data package and data reformatting by gateways (col. 6, line 11

Art Unit: 2124

to col. 7, line 53). Hence, it would have been obvious for one skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement a wrapper to the process of transmitting service components as mentioned by Aravamudan's method so that received components would facilitate transmission via the security control as taught by well-known concept or benefit from encapsulation or protection of data via the refitting or format reconversion as suggested by Reifer.

As per claim 8, Aravamudan does not explicitly disclose downloading the call service occurs while the call controller is operational and supporting live traffic, the call service being downloaded without disrupting the live traffic. But in view of the rationale of claim 2, this limitation would have been obvious for the same rationale as set forth therein.

As per claim 9, Aravamudan discloses an application component for implementing call behavior (e.g. Fig. 2-3; col. 8, line 27 to col. 9, line 7 – Note: implementing a call according to a tree of events reads on call behavior).

As per claim 10, Aravamudan discloses a resource component for providing access to telephony resources (col. 9, lines 8-17; col. 10, lines 12-27; col. 11, lines 12-17) by an application component that implements call behavior.

As per claim 11, Aravamudan (combined with Reifer) discloses establishing a call having an originating segment that uses the call service component downloaded to the call controller by virtue of the rationale as set forth in claim 4.

As per claim 12, Aravamudan does not explicitly disclose that the call service component downloaded to the call controller represents a first call type, and wherein the call has a terminating segment that represents a different call type while the downloading of components has been rendered obvious as in claim 1. Aravamudan discloses the PTSN islands/namespaces

Art Unit: 2124

specific to a certain protocol in the scheme of the 2 sides on a call (col. 5, lines 1-20; col. 6, lines 10-33) and selecting of a component for such context (col. 7, lines 48-59; Fig. 3). Hence the limitation of a first call type relating to a downloaded applet and a different call type relating to another applet being downloaded is implicitly disclosed or, if not, would have been obvious in view of the rationale to download components using the teaching by Reifer as above.

As per claim 13, the limitation as to establishing a call having a terminating segment that uses the call service component downloaded to the call controller would have been the counterpart of the first type of call as mentioned in claim 12; hence would be rejected using the same rationale as set forth above.

As per claim 14, this claim correspond to the counterpart of claim 12 and represent the opposite end of the first type of call as recited therein; hence would be rejected using the same rationale as set forth above.

As per claim 15, Aravamudan discloses a telecommunication system comprising: a repository of call service components; a call controller; and a gateway under control of the call controller (e.g. server, coordinator - Fig. 1; col. 9, lines 8-17); wherein the call controller is configured for retrieving a call service component from the repository (Fig. 4; col. 9, lines 8-17); and using the call service component to support telecommunication traffic to or from the gateway (e.g. servlet 180, applet 175, call coordinator 160 – Fig. 1; col. 10, lines 34 to col. 11, line 17; col. 12, line 40 to col. 13, line 20; Fig. 4).

But Aravamudan does not explicitly teach downloading of the call service component.

This limitation has been addressed in claim 1 above.

Art Unit: 2124

As per claim 16, Aravamudan does not explicitly discloses that the call controller is configured for dynamically downloading the call service component when a network carrier turns on a service, corresponding to the call service component, for a particular user area in the network. But this limitation has been addressed in claim 2 above.

As per claims 17, 18, 19, and 20, these claims correspond to claims 3-4, 6 and 7, respectively; hence are rejected with the corresponding rejection as set forth therein.

As per claim 21, refer to the rationale as set forth in claim 8.

As per claim 22, this claim recites the limitations of claims 9 and 10; hence is rejected with the corresponding cited portions as set forth therein.

As per claim 23, Aravamudan discloses an article comprising a computer-readable medium storing computer-readable instructions for causing a computer system to:

retrieve a particular call service component from a repository of call service components; and

use the particular call service component to support telecommunication traffic to or from a gateway under control of a call controller; all of these limitations having been rejected with Aravamudan with the corresponding cited portions as set forth in claim 1.

But Aravamudan does not explicitly teach downloading of the call service component.

This limitation has been addressed in claim 1 above.

As per claims 24-26 and 27-31, these claims correspond to claims 2-4, and 6-9, respectively; hence are rejected with the corresponding rejection as set forth therein

As per claim 32, this claim recites the limitations of claim 11 and claim 5; hence is rejected with the corresponding cited portions as set forth therein.

Art Unit: 2124

As per claim 33, this claim recites the limitations of claim 13 and claim 5; hence is rejected with the corresponding cited portions as set forth therein.

## Conclusion

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tuan A Vu whose telephone number is (272) 272-3735. The examiner can normally be reached on 8AM-4:30PM/Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kakali Chaki can be reached on (571)272-3719.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-3735 (for non-official correspondence – please consult Examiner before using) or 703-872-9306 (for official correspondence) or redirected to customer service at 571-272-3609.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

VAT \*\*\*\* seveni Me.

KAKALI CHAKI SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100